

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending. By this Response, claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are amended. Allowance of the application based on the above-amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claim 2 due to minor informalities. Specifically, the Office Action states that the recitation of “n said mappers” should be corrected to “n plurality of mappers.” In order to alleviate any confusion by the recitation of “n said mappers” applicants have amended the claim to recite “n mappers”. Since “n” can be any number including one (1), applicants have chosen “n mappers” instead of “n plurality of mappers” as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action alleges claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10 and 11 lack antecedent basis with respect to particular language recited in therein. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Following is a list of limitations recited in the claims for which the Office Action alleges there is insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants address each one of these allegations individually as detailed below.

Claim 1

The limitation of “said data” in line 5: applicants have amended this limitation to now recite “said client data” to provide proper antecedent basis.

Limitation of “said bandwidth allocation” in lines 12-13: applicants have amended this limitation to recite “said predetermined bandwidth allocation” to address the insufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 2

The limitation of said “said client” in lines 15 and 17: applicants have amended these limitations to now recite “said clients” for which antecedent basis is provided by the recitation of “n clients” on line 15 of claim 2.

Claim 6

The limitations of “said STS payload”: applicants have amended claim 6 to now recite “said composite STS payload” to provide proper antecedent basis.

The limitation of “said client” in lines 2 and 3: applicants have amended claim 2 to recite “a client” which provides the proper antecedent basis for “said client” on line 3.

The limitation of “said bandwidth allocation” in line 7: applicants have amended the claim to now recite “said predetermined bandwidth allocation” to provide proper antecedent basis.

Claim 7

The limitation of “said STS payload” in line 10: applicants have amended the claim to now recite “said composite STS payload” to provide proper antecedent basis.

The limitation of “said clients” in line 11: applicants have amended this limitation to now recite “said n clients” to provide proper antecedent basis.

The limitation “said data” in line 12: applicants have amended this limitation to now recite “said mapped data” for which antecedent basis can be found in claim 1.

The limitation “said n clients” in line 12: applicants respectfully submit that antecedent basis is provided for this limitation at claim 2 line 15.

The limitation “said bandwidth allocations” in line 15: applicants have amended this limitation to now recite “said predetermined bandwidth allocations” to provide proper antecedent basis.

Claim 10

The limitation “n clients” in line 6: applicants respectfully submit that the recitation of this limitation is proper. The first recitation of “n clients” in claim 10 does not refer back to any other limitation and is thus proper.

The limitation “said clients” in line 9: applicants have amended this limitation to now recite “said n clients” for which antecedent basis is provided on line 1 of claim 10.

Claim 11

Limitation “said bandwidth allocation” in line 11: applicants have amended this limitation to now recite “said predetermined bandwidth allocation” to provide proper antecedent basis.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims have been made merely to correct procedural concerns and have not been made in view of any cited references. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.


Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Appl. No. 09/728,970

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC/CJB:cb
4450-0444PUS1

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s)